

Appln No. 09/785,643  
Amdt date August 18, 2006  
Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-46 are pending, of which claims 1, 13, 19, 33, 39 and 43 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 13, 19-21, 24-29, 33-35, 39-41 and 43 have been amended. Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention.

In view of amendments to independent claims 1, 13, 19, 33, 39 and 43, the Applicant believes that the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections to claims 1-46 have been overcome and respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-6, 12, 19-21, 24, 30-32 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kay (U.S. 6,223,166) ("Kay"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Amended independent claims 1, 19 and 43 recite, in part: "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added). The Applicant can find no teaching in Kay that teaches all of the above claimed limitations.

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

While Kay may teach that the result of whether the user is granted or denied admission is based merely on the comparison of event information and decoded cypher code when Kay teaches that admission is denied "if the event description and the decoded cypher code do not compare," and more specifically, while Kay may teach "the ticket is accepted by the collector if the bar code, when decoded, . . . corresponds to the ticket information stored in the memory 41 of the terminal 27," it does not teach the claimed limitation of "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." Kay merely teaches that, after collecting and accepting the ticket, "transmitting the ticket to the information system 45 in an operation 423 to check for duplicate tickets" (col. 5, lines 47-51 and 5-7) (emphasis added). Therefore, Kay does not teach all of the above claimed limitations.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 19 and 43 are not anticipated by Kay. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 19 and 43 and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 4-6 and 12 depend from independent claim 1, claims 20-21, 24 and 30-32 depend from independent claim 19 and claims 44-46 depend from independent claim 43. As such, these dependent claims necessarily incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and are therefore patentable at least for the reasons presented above for claims 1, 19 and 43

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

as well as for their additional limitations. The Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 4-6, 12, 20-21, 24, 30-32 and 44-46 and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as also allegedly being anticipated by Kay (U.S. 6,223,166) ("Kay"). The Examiner states that in addition to showing each element of each of claims 39-42 that "'clicking' on a link to access web data is old and well known." The Applicant traverses these rejections. The Applicant also traverses the Official Notice taken by the Examiner.

Amended independent claim 39 recites, in part: "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added). The Applicant can find no teaching in Kay that teaches all of the above claimed limitations.

For at least the reasons provided above with regard to amended independent claims 1, 19 and 43, which each include the same limitation as the limitation recited above for claim 39, Kay does not teach all of the above claimed limitations of claim 39.

Additionally, the Applicant respectfully notes that while 'clicking' on a link to access web data" may be old and well known, the claim 39 limitation of "transmitting a response web page with a link to the value bearing indicium" is not old and well known at the time the claimed invention was invented

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

Additionally, the Applicant requests evidence supporting the assertions that the claimed limitation of: "transmitting a response web page with a link to the value bearing indicium" are old and was well known at the time the claimed invention was invented.

Accordingly, independent claim 39 is not anticipated by Kay. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 39 and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 40-42 depend from independent claim 39. As such, these dependent claims necessarily incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claim and are therefore patentable at least for the reasons presented above for claim 39 as for their additional limitations. The Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 40-42 and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 7-11 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kay in view of Patton et al. (U.S. 6,972,859) ("Patton"). The Applicant traverses these rejections.

Claims 7-11 depend from independent claim 1 and claims and 25-29 depend from independent claim 19, wherein each of claim 1 and claim 19 recite, in part: "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database."

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

(Emphasis added). As such, these dependent claims necessarily incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and therefore this limitation, as well as their additional limitations, are not shown in claims 7-11 and 25-29. For the reasons provided above with regard to claims 1 and 19, Kay does not teach these limitations.

Patton does not cure this deficiency. While Patton may teach a method of authorizing printing of digital images on stamps including transmitting a digital image file to a receiving agency and examining the image to determine whether its contents are acceptable for making stamp images (abstract; col. 2, lines 11-28), it does not teach the claimed limitations. It does not teach the claim limitations of "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added).

Further, there is no motivation to combine Kay and Patton because Kay teaches a principle of operation that is contrary to the Patton principle of operation. While Patton teaches the receiving agency returning stamps to a user via mail or by sending stamps to a specified location for a user to pick up (fig. 4), the principle of operation of Kay is a system and method of allowing a user to print a ticket quickly at home (col. 2, lines 17-44).

Therefore, the Applicant submits that neither Kay nor Patton, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed elements of claims 7-11 and 25-29. Further, the

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine Kay and Patton.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 7-11 and 25-29 are patentable over Kay in view of Patton. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 7-11 and 25-29 and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2-3, 22-23, 33-38 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kay in view of Payne et al. (U.S. 5,715,314) ("Payne").

Regarding claims 2-3 and 22-23, claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1, claims 22-23 depend from independent claim 19 and claim 42 depends from independent claim 39. Each of independent claims 1, 19 and 39 recite, in part: "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium data is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added). As such, these dependent claims necessarily incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims and therefore, for the reasons provided with regard to claims 1, 19 and 42 above, this limitation, as well as their additional limitations, are not taught in Kay.

Payne does not cure this deficiency. While Payne may teach a network-based sales system including a buyer computer at which a user can request to purchase a product, a payment computer at which the user request is received and payment received and a

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

merchant computer at which a command to send a user the purchased product, (abstract), it does not teach the claimed limitations of "wherein the validity status of the value bearing indicium data is determined to be already redeemed when the value bearing indicium data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added).

Therefore, the Applicant submits that neither Kay nor Payne, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed elements of claims 2-3 and 22-23. Further, the Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine Kay and Patton.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 2-3 and 22-23 are patentable over Kay in view of Payne. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2-3 and 22-23 and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 33-38 depend from independent claim 33. Independent claim 33 recites, in part: "wherein the validity status of the ticket is determined to be already redeemed when the ticket data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added).

Regarding independent claim 33, while Kay may teach that the result of whether the user is granted or denied admission is based merely on the comparison of event information and decoded cypher code when Kay teaches that admission is denied "if the event description and the decoded cypher code do not compare," and more specifically, while Kay may teach "the ticket is

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

accepted by the collector if the bar code, when decoded, . . . corresponds to the ticket information stored in the memory 41 of the terminal 27," it does not teach the now-claimed limitation of "wherein the validity status of the ticket is determined to be already redeemed when the ticket data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." Kay merely teaches later, after collecting and accepting the ticket, "transmitting the ticket to the information system 45 in an operation 423 to check for duplicate tickets" (col. 5, lines 47-51 and 5-7) (emphasis added). Therefore Kay does not teach all of the above claimed limitations.

Payne does not cure this deficiency. While Payne may teach a network-based sales system including a buyer computer at which a user can request to purchase a product, a payment computer at which the user request is received and payment received and a merchant computer at which a command to send a user the purchased product, (abstract), it does not teach the claimed limitations of "wherein the validity status of the ticket is determined to be already redeemed when the ticket data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database." (Emphasis added).

Therefore, the Applicant submits that neither Kay nor Payne, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed elements of claim 33.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 33 is patentable over Kay in view of Payne. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 33 and that this claim be allowed.



**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

Claims 34-38 depend from independent claim 33. As such, these dependent claims necessarily incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claim and therefore, for the reasons provided with regard to claim 33, the claimed limitation of "wherein the validity status of the ticket is determined to be already redeemed when the ticket data and a redeemed status thereof are found in the validation information database," (emphasis added) as well as their additional limitations, are not taught or suggested by Kay and Payne, either alone or in combination.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that neither Kay nor Payne, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the claimed elements of claims 34-38.


For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 34-38 are patentable over Kay in view of Payne. The Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 34-38 and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested.

**Appln No. 09/785,643**  
**Amdt date August 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office action of June 21, 2006**

If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Deidra D. Ritcherson  
Reg. No. 55,574  
626/795-9900

DDR/sls

SLS PAS690648.1--\*-08/18/06 11:30 AM